



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,786	06/04/2001	Felix Yen	2657.2003-001	2843

21005 7590 06/06/2005

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.  
530 VIRGINIA ROAD  
P.O. BOX 9133  
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/873,786

Applicant(s)

YEN ET AL.

Examiner

Oanh L. Duong

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,20-37 and 39-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,20-37 and 39-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/17/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 19 and 38 have been canceled.

Claims 1-18, 20-37 and 39-44 are presented for examination.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 01/10/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13, 20-24-32 and 39-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel et al. (Maissel) (US 6,637,029) in view of Barrett et al. (Barrett) (WO 01/22731 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Maissel teaches method for generating and using viewership profiles to facilitate distributing promotions based on the profiles of at least one network device (Fig. 8A-8B and abstract), comprising:

collecting viewership activity data for a network device (col.11 lines 56-44);  
correlating the viewership activity data with program schedule (col. 12 lines 16-22);  
generating a viewership profile for the network device based on the collection (col. 12 lines 12-34).

Maissel does not explicitly teach forwarding the viewership profile to the network device, the viewership profile including long-term viewership activity data of the network device; collecting short-term viewership activity data of the network device; and correlating the collected short-term viewership activity data with the long-term viewership activity data of the viewership profile in order to determine a type of individual presently interacting with the network device.

Barrett, in the same field of endeavor, teaches teach forwarding the viewership profile to the network device, the viewership profile including long-term viewership activity data of the network device (pages 4-5 step (h)); collecting short-term viewership activity data of the network device (pages 4-5 step (h)); and correlating the collected short-term viewership activity data with the long-term viewership activity data of the viewership profile in order to determine a type of individual presently interacting with the network device (pages 4-5 step (h)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maissel to include steps of forwarding the viewership profile to the network device, the viewership profile including long-term viewership activity data of the network device; collecting short-term viewership activity data of the network device; and correlating the collected short-term viewership activity data with the long-term viewership activity data of the viewership profile in order to determine a type of individual presently interacting with the network device as taught by Barrett because it would allow viewer(s) of television to receive and view individualized television commercial(s), thereby improving and increasing the success of the selected and adapted television commercial advertisement session(s) (Barrett, page 2 claim 1).

Regarding claim 1, the system of claim 1 performs a corresponding method of claim 26; therefore, claim 1 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 26.

Regarding claims 2 and 27, Maissel teaches the viewership activity data of the network device includes a program channel on the network device (col. 11 lines 60-61).

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claims 3 and 28, Maissel teaches the viewership activity data includes a time at which the network device was tuned to the channel (col. 12 lines 16-34).

Regarding claims 4 and 29, Maissel teaches the viewership activity includes a time at which the network device was tuned away from the channel (col. 12 lines 26-45).

Regarding claim 5, 25, 30 and 44, Maissel teaches collecting viewership activity data collects viewership activity data if the difference between at time the network device was tuned to the channel and a time the network device was tuned away from the channel is greater than a configurable time period (col. 17 lines 17-44)

Regarding claims 6 and 31, Maissel teaches collecting viewership activity data is performed over a twenty-four hour period (col. 12 lines 26-31).

Regarding claims 7 and 32, Maissel teaches the viewership activity data includes a program viewed by a viewer (col. 11 lines 59-61).

Regarding claim 8, Maissel teaches the viewership activity data provides a percentage of time the program was viewed by the viewer (col. 12 lines 35-41 and col. 17 lines 24-38).

Regarding claim 9, Maissel teaches wherein the percentage of time is precise to within about one percent (col. 17 lines 24-38).

Regarding claim 10, Maissel teaches the program belongs to a genre (col. 11 lines 7-37).

Regarding claim 11, Maissel teaches the viewership activity data provides a percentage of time which the genre is viewed (col. 12 lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 12, Maissel teaches the percentage of time is precise to within about one percent (col. 17 lines 24-38).

Regarding claim 13, Maissel teaches the program belongs to multiple genres (col. 11 lines 7-32).

Regarding claims 20 and 39, Maissel teaches the short-term viewership activity spans over a time period of about one minute (col. 17 lines 32-34).

Regarding claims 21 and 40, Maissel teaches the short-term viewership activity spans over a time period of about one hour (col. 17 lines 17-44).

Regarding claims 22 and 41, Maissel teaches the viewership profile includes viewership activity data spanning a time period of about four weeks (col. 12 lines 16-34).

Regarding claims 23 and 42, Maissel teaches wherein the viewership profile includes viewership activity data spanning a time period of about eight weeks (col. 12 lines 16-34).

Regarding claims 24 and 43, Maissel teaches the viewership profile includes viewership activity data spanning a time period of about twelve weeks (col. 12 lines 16-34).

3. Claims 14-18 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maissel et al. (Maissel) (US 6,637,029) in view of Barrett et al. (Barrett) (WO 01/22731 A1) in further view of Swix et al. (Swix) (US 6,718,551 B1)

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claims 14 and 33, Maissel-Barrett does not explicitly teaches the viewership profile data is matched with a group profile

Swix, in the same field of endeavor, teaches the viewership profile data is matched with a group profile (col. 8 lines 4-8).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maissel-Barrett to include a group profile as taught by Swix because it would effectively target advertisement to a demographic group.

Regarding claims 15 and 34, Swix-Barrett-Maissel teaches the group profile is based on viewer attributes (Swix, col. 5 lines 10-13).

Regarding claims 16 and 35, Swix-Barrett-Maissel teaches the attributes include a geographic location (Swix, col. 3 lines 3-23).

Regarding claims 17 and 36, Swix-Barrett-Maissel teaches the attributes include demographic characteristics (Swix, col. 5 lines 10-13).

Regarding claims 18 and 37, Maissel teaches the attributes include a genre of programs (Maissel, col. 11 lines 30-32).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3983. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.




Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O.D  
May 27, 2005

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100